

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 07/29/2003

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/899,530	07/06/2001	Toshiya Kojima	Q64665	3383
7.	590 07/29/2003			
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC		EXAMINER		
	00 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW ashington, DC 20037-3213		LIANG, LEONARD S	ONARD S
	•		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		•	2853	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			7
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	1
Advisory Action	09/899,530	KOJIMA ET AL.	
,, , ,	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Leonard S Liang	2853	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 11 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of AppetExamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this appli 1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a ich places the application i	in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three movement patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate extension for the final Office action; or (2) as se	ee under et forth in
<ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant'</li> <li>37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF</li> </ol>			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note by	pelow);		
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or simplify	ying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.	
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):		
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amer	ndment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		sidered but does NOT plac	ce the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were new	<b>/</b> ly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			1
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: <u>3,6,10 and 13</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected: 1-2, 4-5, 7-9, 11-12.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disap	proved by the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).		
10. ☐ Other:			
<del></del>	-	2	
		Stephen D. Meier Primary Examiner	

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments are not persuasive, especially in view of the applicant's narrow interpretation of the claims..